DP

UNITED
NATIONS

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1993/55/Add.1
27 May 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York
Item 10 (b) of the provisional agenda

OTHER MATTERS

Proposal concerning location of United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Population Fund headquarters

Potential impact on the United Nations system

Report of the Administrator

SUMMARY

The present addendum to the report on the proposal concerning location of United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Population Fund headquarters is submitted pursuant to paragraph 2 (a) of Governing Council decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992. It summarizes the replies to the note verbale sent by the Secretary-General to all members of the Programme regarding the potential impact of a relocation to Bonn on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development.

1. In paragraph 2 (a) of its decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council requested the Administrator to examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of a relocation to Bonn on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and on cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions.

2. It was considered that the consultations with Member States called for in paragraph 2 (a) of decision 92/44 should be conducted through a note verbale to be issued by the Secretary-General. It was further considered that such consultations should await deliberations at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, particularly as they related to the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system and the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields.

3. By the note verbale from the Secretary-General of 22 January 1993, reproduced in the annex to the present report, all members of the Programme were asked for their views on the issues referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of Governing Council decision 92/44, taking into account the outcome of deliberations held during the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly and in particular resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992.

4. As of 20 May 1993, replies from or on behalf of 46 States had been received. Replies were received from the following States: Argentina; Colombia; Finland; Germany; Paraguay; Poland; Russian Federation; Saint Lucia; Solomon Islands (on behalf of the nine members of the South Pacific Forum that are United Nations Members); Switzerland; United States of America; Vanuatu (on behalf of the member States of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)).

5. The 35 AOSIS members, who gave a common reply, are the following: Antigua and Barbuda; Bahamas; Barbados; Belize; Cape Verde; Comoros; Cook Islands; Cuba; Cyprus; Dominica; Fiji; Grenada; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Jamaica; Kiribati; Maldives; Malta; Marshall Islands; Mauritius; Micronesia (Federated States of); Nauru; Papua New Guinea; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; Sao Tome and Principe; Seychelles; Singapore; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tuvalu; Vanuatu.

6. The nine South Pacific Forum United Nations Members, who gave a common reply, are the following: Australia; Fiji; Marshall Islands; Micronesia (Federated States of); New Zealand; Papua New Guinea; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Vanuatu.

7. Of the 46 replies received, 41 Member States indicated negative implications of relocation. Three Member States indicated positive implications of relocation while two Member States considered it too early to give a definitive response.

8. The replies from or on behalf of the 41 Member States that indicated negative implications of relocation included the following views:

(a) A move of UNDP and UNFPA headquarters away from New York would make these organizations less accessible to all members of the international

community and would seriously hamper Member States, particularly the developing countries, in their efforts to interact with UNDP and UNFPA;

(b) It is consistent with efforts to consolidate the activities of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields for these organizations to remain headquartered in New York;

(c) The physical separation of the central funding organization and other operational organizations from the United Nations Headquarters would not contribute to the aim of strengthening the United Nations development sector as a whole but would undermine the comprehensive nature of the activities of the United Nations with regard to sustainable development;

(d) The contact and interaction of UNDP and UNFPA with the international financial institutions headquartered in Washington is of fundamental importance and the synergetic effect produced by this close proximity would be lost if these entities were to disperse;

(e) The lack of representation of many Member States in Bonn would preclude contact with UNDP and UNFPA and make it difficult for them to follow programmes on an ongoing basis; these organizations would best be able to serve all their respective constituents by remaining in New York at the United Nations Headquarters;

(f) It is important to refrain from the establishment of new United Nations centres.

9. The replies from the three Member States that indicated positive implications of relocation included the following views:

(a) Bonn would be made a national and international centre for North-South cooperation;

(b) A move to Bonn would be an important contribution to the ongoing process of reforming the operational activities for development of the United Nations system: it would support the efforts to embrace a new scope of activities, to increase efficiency and effectiveness, to enhance coordination, to decentralize certain functions to the field, to increase the scope of professional expertise and to streamline the whole system;

(c) A move to Bonn would bring UNDP and UNFPA closer to Africa and to the new recipients in Eastern Europe, the Baltic States and Central Asia;

(d) The proposed relocation will also bring UNDP and UNFPA closer to the United Nations relief organizations, most of the specialized agencies, the European Community and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development;

(e) Closer cooperation with bilateral donors in Europe would increase public awareness; it could also make the comparative advantages of multilateral technical cooperation more apparent to parliaments; this could result in increased funding.

Annex

NOTE VERBALE OF 22 JANUARY 1993 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO MEMBERS OF THE PROGRAMME

EOSG/ORG/93/1

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to ... and has the honour to refer to the provisions of paragraph 2 of the attached decision 92/44 adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on 26 May 1992, calling for consultations with members of the Programme on various aspects of the potential implications and impact of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host in Bonn from 1996 onwards the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme, of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund.

Paragraph 2 (b) of the decision, requesting consultations with members of the Programme on the potential logistical and related implications for Member States of the proposed relocation has already been the subject of a note verbale sent by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to members of the Programme on 4 August 1992.

It was considered that the implementation of paragraph 2 (a) of the decision, requesting that an examination be undertaken, in consultation with the members of the Programme, of the potential impact of the proposed relocation on "(i) the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and (ii) cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions", should await deliberations at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, particularly as they related to the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system and the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields.

Following the suspension of the forty-seventh session, the Secretary-General would be grateful if His/Her Excellency's Government, taking into account the outcome of deliberations during the session, including in particular resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992 (enclosed), could communicate to him as soon as possible and not later than 1 March 1993, the views of his/her Government on the issues referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of the decision.

22 January 1993

S.B.